UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,749	03/30/2004	Dominique Charmot	RLY 04031.101	7226
	7590 01/13/201 OWERS LLP (ILPS)	EXAMINER		
100 NORTH BI	, , , ,	YOUNG, MICAH PAUL		
17TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO	O 63102	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/814,749	CHARMOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618	

	MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
	brief in compliance with 27 CED 41	27 must be filed with	in two months of			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>18 December 2009</u>. A the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the			
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core 			cause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	L below),				
` ' = '	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	,					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	allowance			
See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13.						
/Michael G. Hartley/	/MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	6 /				
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	Examiner, Art Unit 1618					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims remain drawn to an oral formulation comprising core-shell particles and an excipient comprising a core and a shell component. The core is a cation exchange resin and the shell is a crosslinked resin of a specific thickness and comprising certain monomers. The prior art continues to disclose an obviating combination comprising the same cation exchange resin core coated with a similar crosslinked resin comprising the same monomers. The Notenbomer patent discloses the same cation exchange resin core and the Cohen patent provides the coating. Applicant argues that the Cohen patent is nonanalogous art and does not solve the same problem as the instant claims, however these features are not recited in the claims and the Cohen patent solves the same problem of the Notenbomber patent by providing a microparticulate formulation where the particles do not disintegrate in the body. For these reasons the claims remain obviated.